

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>JASON R. ODEM,</b>	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 3:08-CV-01196-L</b>
	)	<b>ECF</b>
<b>CENTEX HOMES, A Nevada General</b>	)	
<b>Partnership,</b>	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	


**ORDER**

The District Court referred this case to the United States Magistrate Judge for pretrial management. Before the Court for consideration is the Motion for Sanctions (“Motion,” doc. 136) of Defendant Centex Homes (“Defendant”). Defendant seeks the following relief:

- (1) an injunction against Shavitz Law Group (“SLG”) and Morgan and Morgan (“M&M”) barring them from making any further contact with any potential class member and enjoining them from soliciting, entering into an agreement for, charging, or collecting a fee for professional employment from any potential class member from this date forward without prior Court approval;
  - (2) an injunction against SLG and M&M barring them from representing any individual, including any current Opt-In Plaintiff, who did not work with the named Plaintiff in this action, Jason Odem;
  - (3) an order compelling SLG and M&M to produce to the Court for an in camera inspection of all documents relating to any communications, including telephone records and emails, between any member of SLG and M&M and current Opt-In Plaintiffs as well as between SLG and M&M and any potential class member to determine the extent of the improper solicitations;
  - (4) an order requiring SLG and M&M to reimburse Centex Homes for its reasonable fees and costs incurred in bringing this Motion;
  - (5) such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate, such as revocation of the *pro hac vice* admissions granted to SLG and M&M for failing to abide by the requirements of such admission; and
  - (6) any further relief to which the Court finds Centex to be justly entitled.
- After due consideration of the Motion, Plaintiff’s opposition, Defendant’s reply, and the

procedural status of this case, the Court denies requests for relief numbers 1-3 as moot and denies requests for relief numbers 4-6. Accordingly, the Motion (doc. 136) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, June 11, 2010.



---

PAUL D. STICKNEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE